

REMARKS

Claims 1-46 are pending in the present application. Claim 44 is currently amended.

In the Abstract

The Examiner stated that “[t]he abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.” Furthermore, the Examiner stated that “Applicant’s abstract refers to speculative applications by suggesting examples of symbols and positions.”

Applicant has amended the Abstract, such that any suggestion of comparison to the prior art has been removed. In addition, Applicant has removed references to examples in accordance with the Examiner’s request. No new matter is believed added.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

The Examiner rejected claims 44-46 because the “claimed invention appears to be a mathematical algorithm performing calculations or data manipulation that indicates a result which lacks providing a useful, concrete and tangible result, there from.” Applicant has amended claim 44, such that the method can be performed “on a computing machine.” Claims 45 and 46 are performed “on a computing machine” by virtue of their dependency upon claim 44. Accordingly, Applicant believes the rejection overcome.

The method recited in the claims produces an algorithm having a sufficiently useful, concrete, and tangible result. As indicated in the specification, such algorithms are implemented in gaming machines and in the development of gaming machines. They greatly improve the efficiency of gaming machines and game machine development platforms, and thereby reduce requirements for computing resources. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 12-22, 24-25, 27-28, 30-36, 38-39, and 41-44 under 35 USC § 102 in view of the Lawrence reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,967,983). The Lawrence reference may disclose the broad concept of relating symbolic game arrangements to numbers, but it fails to suggest the specific applications and elements recited in the pending claims.

Independent claims 1, 14, and 44 of the present application recite “converting a number representing a game arrangement into a symbolic representation of the game arrangement.”

In contrast, the Lawrence reference provides a “method for ordering all of the possible hands into a particular sequence Given a particular hand ..., all of the possible hands arising from the particular hand ... is iterated and the types of all possible resulting hands tabulated.... After the iteration is completed, the results obtained is a tabulation of each combination of hands obtained.” (Lawrence Abstract.) More particularly, Lawrence discloses methods for providing a tabulation of possible hands arising from a particular hand, in order to produce assigned numbers that correspond to these possible hands. However, Lawrence does not specifically disclose or suggest “converting a number representing a game arrangement into a symbolic representation of the game arrangement.” In one example of the present invention, converting a number into symbolic representation of the game arrangement is converting a number such as 254 into a game arrangement such as a Bar, Lemon, Bar across a slot machine payline, or a particular hand of cards in a poker game. (Page 1, lines 10-19 for description of “game arrangements”; page 21, lines 3-5 for description of converting a number to a game arrangement.) However, Lawrence does not disclose converting any of these assigned numbers to game arrangements. Accordingly, the Applicant believes that the rejection regarding claims 1, 14, and 44, along with their dependent claims is overcome.

Independent claims 25 and 36 of the present application recite “generating a number representing a game arrangement from a symbolic representation of the game arrangement.” Furthermore, these claims also recite “using the number representing the game arrangement during game play on a gaming machine.” None of the cited portions of the Lawrence reference specifically disclose or suggest using an assigned number “during game play on the gaming machine.” Accordingly, the Applicant believes that the rejection regarding claims 25 and 36, along with their dependent claims is overcome.


Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected dependent claims 11, 23, 29, and 40, under 35 USC § 103 over Lawrence in view of the Applicant’s Admission. However, with regard to the statements above relating to the Examiner’s 35 USC § 102 rejection, the Applicant believes this rejection is overcome. In particular, because the independent claims, which form the basis for dependent claims 11, 23, 29, and 40 are now believed allowable, the dependent claims are also believed allowable.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Stephanie L. Kwan
Reg. No. 53,168

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778